



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/825,814	04/16/2004	Min-Hyo Lee	5000-1-578	8681
33942	7590	05/15/2008		
CHA & REITER, LLC 210 ROUTE 4 EAST STE 103 PARAMUS, NJ 07652			EXAMINER SEPCHECK, GREGORY B	
			ART UNIT 2619	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 05/15/2008	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant's arguments are not convincing. The Examiner has reviewed all of the record and believes the rejections of claims 1-13 are proper.

On pg. 6-7 of the Remarks, Applicant contends that the disclosure relied upon in Koch to reject the claim limitations involving an "OLT" is improper and contrary to terminology as known and understood by persons of ordinary skill in the art. Applicant alleges that one of ordinary skill would understand an OLT to be a service provider endpoint of a passive optical network placed at a central or headend of the network. Since Koch shows PON interface receiving video content from head end 24, it cannot be part of the OLT.

The Examiner respectfully disagrees. While it is agreed that an OLT would be understood as cited by Applicant, Applicant's contention that receiving data from headend 24 at PON interface 12 excludes it from being part of the OLT does not consider the full disclosure cited by Koch. As previously shown in the Response to Arguments of the Final Rejection filed 1/29/2008 (pg. 8), Koch discloses the plurality of node groups 26A-M (corresponding to the claimed ONTs) connecting to a common (or "central", to use wording from the definition cited by Applicant) network infrastructure including the PON interface 12 as well as the headend 24 and all other common infrastructure. Therefore, mapping this common network infrastructure for providing service to customer nodes in a PON, as disclosed in Koch, to the claimed OLT is proper and consistent with the ordinary understanding of OLT.

On pg. 7-8 of the Remarks, Applicant contends that the proxy agents shown in Koch do not properly meet the claim language of "including a DHCP server in the OLT".

The Examiner respectfully disagrees. The proxy agents shown in Koch results in the presence of a DHCP server in PON interface. Therefore, this interpretation of the claim language and subsequent mapping to Koch would also be proper in rejecting the pending claims.

/Gregory B Sefcheck/

Examiner, Art Unit 2619

5-12-2008

/Wing F. Chan/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2619

5/13/08